UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHER and STOTE CT-09898 USB Obcument 2608 Filed 07/10/09 Page 1 of 4

In Re: Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether: Master File C.A. No.

("MTBE") Products Liability: 00 Civ. 1898 (SAS)

Litigation: MDL 1358

This document pertains to:

City of New York v. Amerada Hess, et al.,

No. 04 Civ. 3417

JAMES C. FRANCIS IV

The Court having reviewed the objections to designated portions of the deposition of Frederick M. Anderson, the objections

<u>Tab</u>	Pages/Lines	Ruling
	19:10 - 19:16	Overruled; no foundation is required to ask a witness about whether the witness received certain information.
2	20:03-20:04 20:09-20:12	Overruled; the answers are sufficiently responsive.
3	29:07 - 29:10	Overruled; the generality of the answer is congruent with the question.
4	38:06 - 38:14	Overruled; the witness is properly questioning an assumption implicit in the question.
5	49:16 - 50:08	Sustained; the statements of counsel are irrelevant; if necessary, counsel can agree on some joint statement to place exhibits in context.
6	51:05 - 51:19	Overruled; here the statements of counsel clarify the nature of the exhibits.
7	53:16-54:01 54:07-54:14	Overruled; the questions are sufficiently specific, and the evidentiary foundation may be satisfied by reference to other
US	DS SDNY	parts of the record.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

are determined as follows:

1

Tab	<u>Pages/Lines</u>	<u> KULLIIQ</u>
	Case 1:00-cv-01898-VSB	Document 2608 Filed 07/10/09 Page 2 of 4
8	56:06 - 56:15	Overruled; the witness can testify to the knowledge of others insofar as he is referring to information he communicated to them.
9	69:11 - 69:18	Overruled; events outside New York are relevant to the defendant's knowledge of the effects of MTBE on groundwater.
10	74:22-75:13 75:14-75:22	Overruled; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 9.
11	76:02-76:06 76:07-76:15 76:16-76:20 76:21-76:22	Overruled; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 9; based on the witness' background, he appears to be competent to offer this testimony.
12	77:01 - 77:16	Overruled; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 9.
13	78:22 - 79:09	Overruled; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 9.
14	80:13-80:14 80:15-80:22	Overruled; see ruling for Tab 9; the questions are sufficiently specific.
15	86:03 - 86:08	Overruled; the testimony explains the exhibit.
	86:15 - 88:06	Overruled; testimony is relevant to defendant's response to contamination.
	88:07 - 89:13	Overruled; the testimony completes the witness' prior response and provides explanation of the exhibit.
16	98:01 - 98:12	Overruled; the testimony completes the witness' response.
17	107:14 - 107:22	Sustained; the testimony only indicates that the witness is reading a document, not that he is agreeing with its substance or interpretation.
18	108:08 - 108:20	Sustained; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 17.

<u>Tab</u>	<u>Pages/Lines</u>	<u> Rulinq</u>
19	Case 1:00-cv-01898-VSB 117:12 - 117:21	Document 2608 Filed 07/10/09 Page 3 of 4 Overruled; the question was sufficiently specific and the witness responded with no difficulty.
20	121:07-121:15	Sustained; vague.
	121:16-122:02	Overruled; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 9.
21	122:21-123:04 123:14-124:01 124:01-124:12	Sustained; irrelevant and speculative.
22	125:18 - 125:21	Sustained; irrelevant, statements of counsel.
23	126:20 - 127:02	Sustained; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 22.
24	137:02 - 137:05	Overruled; <u>see</u> ruling for Tab 9.
25	140:19 - 141:17	Overruled; the questions are sufficiently specific and the witness demonstrates the ability to respond.
26	147:12 - 147:14	Overruled; the answer is responsive and relevant.

SO ORDERED.

JAMES C. FRANCIS IV
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: New York, New York

July 9, 2009

Copies mailed this date:

Susan E. Amron, Esq. Environmental Law Division New York City Law Department 100 Church Street New York, New York 10007 Victor M. Sher, Esq.

Joshua (\$\frac{1}{2}\text{100} \text{100} \text{100} \text{1000} \te

Robert S. Chapman, Esq. Greenberg Glusker LLP 1900 Avenue of the Stars, 21st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067

Peter John Sacripanti, Esq. James A. Pardo, Esq. Stephen J. Riccardulli, Esq. McDermott Will & Emery LLP 340 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10173

Anthony A. Bongiorno, Esq. McDermott Will & Emery LLP 28 State Street Boston, MA 02109

Jennifer Kalnins Temple, Esq. McDermott Will & Emery LLP 18191 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 500 Irvine, CA 92612-7108

William Stack, Esq. Exxon Mobile Corporation P.O. Box 2180 Houston, TX 77252